REMARKS

The Non-final Office Action dated August 24, 2006 has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-48 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-48 are pending.

Claim objections

Claim 16 was objected to for containing a typographical error. Claim 16 has been amended. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claims 7-12 and 24-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 7-12 and 24-29 have been amended. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 1-4, 7-17, 36, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants disagree with the Office Action's position. However, to expedite prosecution, claims 1-4, 7-17, 36 and 39 have been amended. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 18-34, 37 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as reciting a carrier wave. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 18-34, 37 and 40 have been amended. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 35, 38, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not "describing hardware." This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants disagree with the Office Action's position. Nevertheless, to expedite prosecution, claims 35, 38, and 41 have been amended. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 43–48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not producing "a tangible result." This rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicants disagree with the Office Action's position. However, to expedite prosecution, claims 43–48 have been amended. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1–4, 7, 13, 14, 17–21, 24, 30, 31, 33–41, and 43–48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mellen–Garnett (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0093479). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 18 recite recording at least one action corresponding to a first application and an associated relationship between the at least one action of the first application and a recorded action of a second application. Claim 35 recites an action of a first application, a second application and an associated relationship with the action corresponding to the first application. Claims 36–38 and 41 recite an associated relationship with a recorded logical action of the second computer–related source. Claims 39 and 40 recite recording an associated relationship between the first logical action and the second logical action. Mellen–Garnett (paragraphs 34 and 41) fails to teach or suggest these features.

Mellen–Garnett discloses at paragraph 34 a "collaboration module" that receives data from a first application, writes the data in a new format, and provides the data to a second application. Thus, at best, Mellen–Garnett merely discloses receiving data, reformatting the data, and sending the reformatted data to a destination. This is unrelated to claim 1, 18, or 35–41. For example, Mellen–Garnett fails to each or suggest

recording an associated relationship between an action of a first application and an action of a second application. In fact, nowhere does Mellen–Garnett teach or suggest recording anything at all much less recording an associated relationship between an action of a first application and an action of a second application. In addition, even assuming the Office Action's assertion that Mellen–Garnett discloses a second application is correct, Mellen–Garnett still fails to teach or suggest an action of a second application or a relationship of the action of the second application to an action of the first application.

Mellen–Garnett at paragraph 41 also fails to teach or suggest these features. At paragraph 41, Mellen–Garnett discloses collaboration modules that are objects in a server that are registered or de-registered dynamically. Also, the modules create or manage objects as needed. This disclosure is unrelated to claim 1 or 18. The Office Action merely asserts that Mellen–Garnett discloses these features at paragraph 41 but fails to provide a logical rationale to support the contention. Indeed, nowhere in paragraph 41 (or anywhere else in the reference) does Mellen–Garnett teach or suggest the features of claim 1, 18, or 35–41.

Claim 1 also recites executing a first operation on the action of the first application, the first operation causing a first modification to the at least one action of the first application and executing a second operation on the recorded action of the second application responsive to the execution of the first operation on the at least one action of the first application and based on the relationship between the at least one action of the first application and the recorded action of the second application. The Office Action cites Mellen–Garnett at paragraphs 34, 41, or 43 for this disclosure. However, contrary to the Office Action's assertion, Mellen–Garnett fails to teach or suggest these features.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/786,674
Attorney Docket Number: 305378.01
Filing Date: February 25, 2004

18/23

Mellen–Garnett discloses at paragraph 34 a module receiving data from a first application and sending the data to a second application. At paragraph 41, Mellen–Garnett discloses that the module is an object in a server that is registered or de-registered and creates or manages objects as needed (page 3). At paragraph 43, Mellen–Garnett discloses services that are required by the module to carry out integration tasks. These services include a name service, registry service, event service, etc.

As set forth above, Mellen–Garnett fails to teach or suggest a relationship between an action of the first application and a recorded application of the second application. Having failed to teach or suggest the relationship, Mellen–Garnett also fails to teach or suggest executing a second operation based on the relationship. Also, even assuming Mellen–Garnett discloses a module that is an object in a server that receives data from one application and forwards the data to a second application as asserted by the Office Action, Mellen–Garnett still fails to teach or suggest executing a first operation on an action of a first application and executing a second operation on an action of a second application responsive to the execution of the first operation based on the relationship. Indeed, Mellen–Garnett fails to teach or suggest a relationship (or recording the relationship) at all.

Claim 1 also recites a second operation causing a second modification to the action of the second application corresponding to the first modification to the action of the first application. Claim 18 recites the action of the first application and the action of the second application are modified based on the action management operation. Claim 35 recites a modification of the action of the second application and a corresponding modification of he action of the first application. Claims 39, 40 recite modifying the first logical action and the second logical action based on the recorded associated relationship. Mellen–Garnett fails to teach or suggest these features.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element is set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). In the present case, Mellen–Garnett fails to set forth each and every element in the claims as set forth above. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action further asserts that Mellen–Garnett (paragraphs [0046] and [0047]) discloses claim 43. However, Mellen–Garnett at paragraphs [0046] and [0047] is unrelated to the features of claim 43. The Office Action merely provides a conclusory assertion that Mellen–Garnett at paragraphs [0046] and [0047] somehow discloses the features of claim 43 without providing a logical rationale for the assertion. Indeed, nowhere does Mellen–Garnett in the cited paragraphs or in the entire reference teach or suggest the features of claim 43.

It is noted that in a proper anticipatory rejection, "the identical invention must be shown [in the cited reference] in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The Office Action provides a conclusory assertion that Mellen–Garnett discloses claim 43 somewhere in paragraphs [0046] and [0047]. However, review of the cited portions of Mellen–Garnett reveal that Mellen–Garnett, in fact, fails to teach or suggest any of the features of claim 43, either at paragraphs [0046] and [0047], or anywhere else in the reference. Therefore, in the absence of an articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the Office Action's allegation, it is respectfully submitted the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 18, 35–41, and 43 is respectfully requested.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/786,674
Attorney Docket Number: 305378.01
Filing Date: February 25, 2004

Claims 2–4, 7, 13, 14, 17, 19–21, 24, 30, 31, 33, 34, and 44–48 depend from claim 1, 18, 35–41, or 43 and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2–4, 7, 13, 14, 17, 19–21, 24, 30, 31, 33, 34, and 44–48 is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 22, 23, 32, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mellen–Garnett in view of De Meno (U.S. Patent No. 6,721,767). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 22, 23, and 32 depend from claim 1 or claim 18. As set forth above, Mellen–Garnett fails to teach or suggest claim 1 or claim 18. De Meno fails to cure the deficits of Mellen–Garnett. Nor does the Office Action assert that De Meno teaches or suggests claim 1 or claim 18. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 42 recites receiving an associated relationship between the action of the first computer–related source and an action of a second computer–related source. The Office Action asserts that Mellen–Garnett discloses this feature at paragraph [0034] and [0041]. As set forth above, Mellen–Garnett merely discloses receiving data from one application and forwarding the data to a second application at paragraph [0034] and also discloses at paragraph [0041] a module that creates or manages objects as needed. Contrary to the Office Action's assertion, these disclosures are unrelated to claim 42.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 8 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mellen–Garnett in view of Nainani (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,577). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/786,674
Attorney Docket Number: 305378.01
Filing Date: February 25, 2004

Claim 8 depends from claim 1 and claim 25 depends from claim 18. As set forth above Mellen-Garnett fails to teach or suggest claim 1 or claim 18. Nainani fails to cure the deficits of Mellen-Garnett. The Office Action does not assert that Nainani teaches or suggests any feature of claim 1 or claim 18. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-12, and 26-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mellen-Garnett in view of Multer (U.S. Patent No. 6,925,476). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 9-12 and 26-29 depend from claim 1 or claim 18. As set forth above, Mellen-Garnett fails to teach or suggest claim 1 or 18. Multer fails to cure the deficits of Mellen-Garnett, nor does the Office Action assert that Multer does. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: October 6, 2006   By:_____

Stephen C. Siu, Reg. No.: 48,303
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone (425) 704-0669
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

 October 6, 2006
Date

Signature _____

Kate Marochkina
Printed Name

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/786,674
Attorney Docket Number: 305378.01
Filing Date: February 25, 2004